For the Northern District of California

	TATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
MARYLINE LINARES, et al., Plaintiffs,	No. C-14-3435 EMC
v. CITIMORTGAGE, INC., Defendant.	ORDER DISCHARGING ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE AND RESETTING BRIEFING SCHEDULE ON DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO DISMISS

On August 14, 2014, Defendant filed motions to dismiss and a motion to strike Plaintiffs' complaint, with a noticed hearing date of October 21, 2014. Docket Nos. 13, 14. Plaintiffs' oppositions to these motions were due on August 28, 2014. However, Plaintiffs did not file any opposition. On October 14, 2014, the Court issued an order to show cause why the case should not be dismissed for failure to prosecute. Dkt. No. 17. Plaintiffs responded by sending an email to Court staff which stated Plaintiffs needed additional time to locate an attorney to represent them in this matter. Dkt. No. 18. On November 10, 2014, Rattan Dev S. Dhaliwal filed a notice of appearance on behalf of Plaintiffs and filed a response to the Court's order to show cause. Dkt. No. 21, 22. This response indicated that Plaintiffs failed to respond to Defendants' motions to dismiss and strike due to the distraction and stress associated with handling various personal matters in their lives. Dkt. No. 22, at 3.

The Court hereby discharges its October 14, 2014 order to show cause. Plaintiffs are advised that failure to comply with Court ordered deadlines may result in dismissal of their action. In the future, should they require additional time to respond to pleadings or to comply with deadlines, they

Case 3:14-cv-03435-EMC	Document 24	Filed 12/02/14	Page 2 of 2
must file a request for an extension pending. The Court hereby re-cale shall be filed by January 5, 2015 and	ndars these mot	tions for January	22, 2015. Plaintiffs' opposition
IT IS SO ORDERED.			
Dated: December 2, 2014		EDWARD M. O United States D	CHEN istrict Judge